

III. REMARKS

A. General Remarks

Claims 1 and 8 have been cancelled. Claims 2-5, 9-12, and 15-17 have been amended. Therefore, claims 2-7 and 9-21 are pending in the application.

B. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 19-21 are allowed.

C. Claim Objections

In paragraph 4 of the Office Action, claim 5 is objected to because of a typographical error. In response, Assignee has amended claim 5 to change “even” to --event--.

D. Section 112 Rejections

In paragraph 6 of the Office Action, claims 3, 5-7, 10, and 12-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In response, Assignee has amended the claims as follows:

In claim 3, Assignee has amended the claim by replacing “and” with --or-- to bring clarity to the reading of the claim.

In claim 5, Assignee has reinserted original claim language of --occurrence of-- in the claim to improve the reading of “on a first event” and “on a second event.” Thus, claim 5 has amended claim language that recites “on occurrence of a first event” and “on occurrence of a second event.” This claim language is at least supported by claim 5 as originally filed and by the specification at page 6, lines 14-17. Assignee has also inserted commas where appropriate and has broken the grammatical structure of the claim to make it more readable.

In claim 10, Assignee has amended the claim by replacing “and” with --or-- to bring clarity to the reading of the claim.

In claim 12, Assignee has reinserted original claim language of --occurrence of-- in the claim to improve the reading of “on a first event” and “on a second event.” Thus, claim 12 has amended claim language that recites “on occurrence of a first event” and “on occurrence of a second event.” This claim language is at least supported by claim 12 as originally filed and by

the specification at page 6, lines 14-17. Assignee has also inserted commas where appropriate and has broken the grammatical structure of the claim to make it more readable.

In claim 15, Assignee has deleted the phrase “at a command output.” Assignee has also added and removed commas and has broken the grammatical structure of the claim to make it more readable.

In claim 16, Assignee has deleted the phrases “at a size output”, “at an input”, “at an update output”, “having an input coupled to the holding area manager size output”, “at an output”; “at the requester input”, “having an input coupled to the holding area manager update output”, “via an output “at an update input”, and “at the update input” to improve the readability of the claim. In addition, Assignee has rearranged the grammatical structure of the claim to make it more readable.

In claim 17, Assignee has amended the claim by replacing “and” with --or-- to bring clarity to the reading of the claim. Assignee has also removed the phrases “at the requester output” and “at the update input” so that claim 17 has proper antecedent basis with independent claim 15.

The amendments to claims 3, 5, 10, 12, 15, 16, and 17 are cosmetic in nature and do not narrow the scope of these claims. Because claims 3, 5-7, 10, and 12-18 are only rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and because the above-noted amendments are believed to successfully overcome the 112 rejections, Assignee believes that claims 3, 5-7, 10, and 12-18, as amended, are now allowable and respectfully requests allowance of these claims in the next paper from the Office.

E. Section 103 Rejections

In paragraphs 7-8 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,950,198 (“Falls et al.”) in view of US 6,535,911 (“Miller et al.”).

Claims 1 and 8 have been cancelled. Claims 2 and 4 have been amended to depend from claim 3, which has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of base claim 1. Furthermore, claims 9 and 11 have been amended to depend from claim 10, which has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of base claim 8. Accordingly,

claims 4, 8, 9, and 11 are believed allowable, and Assignee respectfully request allowance of these claims in the next paper from the Office.

F. Conclusion

Reconsideration of the claims in light of the above remarks is respectfully requested. If, after considering this reply, the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be beneficial towards advancing this case to allowance, the examiner is strongly encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney at the number listed.

14 June 2006 Sean McDermott
Date Reg. No. 49,000

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.
20333 SH 249, Ste 600
Houston, TX 77070
832/446-2416
832/446-2424 (facsimile)